



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

most part to have been as wholesome and attractive in their personalities and personal relations as they were effective and vigorous in their life-work. Great and little, they form a pleasant and stimulating company.

VICTOR COFFIN.

England, India, and Afghanistan. An Essay upon the Relations, Past and Future, between Afghanistan and the British Empire in India. [The Le Bas Prize Essay, 1902.] By FRANK NOYCE, B.A. (London: C. J. Clay and Sons; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1902. Pp. xii, 174.)

THIS book, as the title indicates, is a monograph treating historically of one phase or division of the problem of Asia. The author deserves congratulations because of the motive with which the task was undertaken and because in no other place within so small a compass, certainly, has the question of Afghanistan in its unity been described for the student of world politics. Beginning with a brief introductory survey of the earlier relations of Afghanistan to India, Mr. Noyce summarizes in twenty pages the disastrous history of the first Afghan War. The middle period, from 1842 to 1875 (pp. 32-69), is followed by chapters on the second Afghan War, on the reign of Abdur Rahman Khan (1880-1901), and on the present state and future prospects of the problem. In the opening pages the author rightly points out the difficulty which the results of party government often place in the way of the investigator in modern foreign politics. A large part of the literature dealing with almost any British imperial interest of the last century has been affected not merely by national prejudice but by party rancor; thus even if ability and opportunity for accurate information be granted in certain writers, it may be necessary to discover their views concerning Parliamentary reform, the adoption of free trade, or Irish home rule, in order to judge whether their conclusions with respect to Papineau's rebellion, the labor question in Jamaica, or the Armenian massacres can be accepted as non-partizan. In this respect if not in others this book is safe; for the reviewer has tried in vain to discover the author's party affiliation. But, though praise and blame are on the whole fairly distributed to the various agents of the unstable policies evolved between Westminster and Simla, the general impression gathered is that national prejudice has not been so successfully eliminated. Aside from phrases here and there such as that found on p. 173 ("the contempt of the Mahomedan (*sic*) religion they [the Russians] have shown in Central Asia"), which is erroneous, the author has failed to realize that his inadequate treatment of Russian policy, which amounts almost to an exclusion, must result in the mystification of the reader as to the inwardness of Central Asian politics. The lack of any save English authorities (the *Autobiography of Abdur Rahman Khan* excepted) in the very short bibliography is further evidence of the insular attitude of the author, while such a reference as occurs on p. 124 to the "untutored Oriental" should certainly give pause.

It was inevitable that as British prestige and dominion increased in India, the sphere of British Asiatic policy should become continental as well as maritime. Yet the inauguration of diplomatic negotiations with both Persia and Afghanistan might well have been postponed for many years, had not Napoleon Bonaparte by his Egyptian expedition and later by his alliance with Russia alarmed English rulers in India. The author recognizes the influence of the French, but fails to show how thoroughly persuaded were such men of affairs as Henry Dundas (Lord Melville), the Marquis of Wellesley, Lord Nelson, and Sir John Shore (Lord Teignmouth) that British power in India was seriously endangered by Napoleon's plans, and that an active diplomacy in lands to the north and west of India was essential. The missions of Malcolm to Teheran and of Elphinstone to Kabul (1801, not 1802 as on p. 16) were results of Napoleonic politics. Later the substitution of Russia for France as the threatening European power further emphasized the importance of Afghan politics to British India. The summary of the period 1835-1876 is confused, though it shows appreciation of the necessity of the historical method in the study of a contemporary problem. The author condemns Lord Auckland unreservedly for the first Afghan War, but is uncertain regarding Lord Lytton's personal responsibility in 1877-1878. He states (p. 71) that Lord Lytton "knew singularly little of India when he started to govern it, and his opportunities for independent study were limited by the fact that he was chosen to be the instrument for executing a policy preconceived by his political leaders." But on the next page we find that "Lord Lytton was given a very free hand by his leaders," and on p. 98 a parallel is drawn between Bismarck's use of the Benedetti incident at Ems and Lytton's use of the Ali Masjid incident in 1878 — "in each case a scheming statesman was supplied with a pretext, for which he had long wished for bringing about a war he eagerly desired." The ignorance of Lord Salisbury and his ill-conceived assumptions in essential matters as shown in despatches (*Afghan Blue Book*, 1878, pp. 128, 224), when added to the mistakes of Lord Lytton, resulted in a diplomatic and administrative collapse from which only the army under Roberts could extricate the British. The twenty years of Abdur Rahman Khan are favorably reviewed; and in the last chapter the author after discussing various possible occurrences concludes that the *status quo* is safe for a time under Habibullah, and that Great Britain should continue to support an independent friendly government in Afghanistan as long as possible.

The book is written in a confused style, the language here and there being doubtful in point of grammar; and certain archaic forms of English spelling are found, such as "shew." In the matter of oriental names the results are distressing and often inconsistent, *e. g.* Vakil and Wali, Mohamed and Mohammedan. Throughout are found Moghul for Mughal, Mahratta for Maratha, Peishwa for Peshwa, Mahdaji Sindia for Mahadaji Sindhia, *jehad* for *jihad*, Mohamed for Muhammad, etc. General Abrahamoff (p. 89) may be a printer's error for Abramov.

However, in comparing this book with earlier Le Bas prize essays the reader will be impressed with the decided advance in method and scholarship, though he will regret that as the foot-notes have come in style has gone out.

ALFRED L. P. DENNIS.

A Short History of Rome. By W. S. Robinson, M.A., formerly Assistant Master at Wellington College. (New York, Longmans Green, and Company, 1903, pp. viii, 486.) The author declares in his preface that while wars and politics "are not, it is said, all the life of a nation . . . they are that part of its life which determines its fate, and it is in the behaviour of a nation in its wars and politics that we can study its character." Whether this dogma be correct or not, his book must be judged from the success with which he has carried out his own theory of historical interpretation. The principle thus enunciated has been applied with remarkable faithfulness and persistence. A chapter on Roman Literature, which is simply a chronological list of authors with very brief notices of each, and a similar chapter on Roman Life are the only exceptions. Even the many interesting questions of Roman constitutional history do not suffice to draw him aside for more than a few lines. Such a mode of treatment naturally brings individuals into prominence and gives an opportunity for the portrayal of the characters of the great men of Rome. The preface, again, explains that the attempt has been made "to tell the story so as to arouse some interest in the personal fortunes of the actors in the great drama of war and politics, which developed a single small republican state into a world empire under the sway of a single ruler." This promise is not fulfilled; clear, simple, and concise the style is, but it is at the same time dry, and the greatest men along with the least are very lifeless.

Of the four hundred and twenty-five pages devoted to political history, three hundred and sixty-four go to the period of the Republic. The later period "has been continued, with gradually decreasing detail, far enough to bridge over the gap between ancient and mediæval times." Much space is given to the early period. Here narrative alternates with the explanation that the story is more or less legendary; though explanation is sometimes omitted where it would seem particularly necessary, as in the case of the legend of the sacred geese (p. 57). Such is, of course, the usual method of careful scholars who still hold to the orthodox view of early Roman history; but it is unfortunate that such an elaborate process should be necessary, especially in a small book, to tell us that we know little or nothing of those centuries. The account of the wars and politics of the later Republic is the strong part of the book. The narrative of the last one hundred years is remarkably well balanced, but the consistent neglect of constitutional and social history sometimes puts the author in straits. The chapter on the establishment of the Principate is, however, excellent, showing that the neglect of constitutional history is not due to the inability of the author